Case 2:20-cr-00213-KJM Document 34 Filed 06/17/21 Page 1 of 7 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 2 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KIMBERLY J. MUELLER, CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 3 Plaintiff, 4 Sacramento, California VS. 5 No. 2:20-CR-213-KJM Monday, MAY 3, 2021 CHALONER SAINTILLUS, 10:23 A.M. 6 7 Defendant. 8 9 --000--REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10 RE: STATUS CONFERENCE/FARETTA HEARING 11 12 (Hearing conducted via Zoom videoconference) --000--13 **APPEARANCES:** 14 For the Government: U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 15 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 16 By: SAMUEL E. STEFANKI 17 Assistant U.S. Attorney For the Defendant: FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE 18 801 I Street, Third Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 19 By: HANNAH ROSE LABAREE Public Defender 20 21 22 Official Reporter: Tiphanne G. Crowe CSR No. 10958 501 I Street 23 Sacramento, CA 95814 24 Tcrowe.csr@qmail.com 25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript

produced by computer-aided transcription.

2

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, MAY 3, 2021, 10:23 A.M. 1 --000--2 Calling criminal case 20-CR-213-KJM; United States v. 3 Chaloner Saintillus. This matter is on for a status 4 5 conference/ Faretta hearing, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Good morning. Appearances, 6 7 please, for the government. MR. STEFANKI: Good morning, your Honor; Sam Stefanki 8 on behalf of the United States. 9 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Stefanki. For Mr. -- is 10 it Saintillus? 11 MS. CRAGER: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MS. CRAGER: Mia Crager and Hootan Baigmohammadi --14 Baigmohammadi (pronouncing) -- I'm sorry -- for the defense, 15 and we're appearing here by Zoom, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Ms. Crager, and 17 Mr. -- it's Baigmohammadi? 18 MR. BAIGMOHAMMADI: You said it perfectly. Good 19 20 morning, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you. I see --21 22 is Mr. Saintillus appearing from the county jail? Mr. 23 Saintillus, can you see and hear the Court? It doesn't appear that Mr. Saintillus is muted. Let me ask the deputy, the 24 25 deputy marshal who is present.

Are you able to hear the Court and see the Court?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, your Honor; we can. We can see and hear you, and he is present.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, sir. All right. Let me ask, this is calendared for status and also there's a notation of a potential need for a Faretta hearing.

Ms. Crager, what is your understanding of the current status?

MS. CRAGER: Yes, your Honor. We were able to confirm with our client right before court in a breakout session. At that time he did tell us he would like to continue working with us and proceed with us as counsel. At this point, there's no further need for a Faretta hearing, so we can just proceed with the general status on the case.

He did want me to put a few things on the record.

They relate to the merits of the case and some substantive issues that we intend to bring up with the Court later at an appropriate time. So at this point, we don't have anything other than the general status about the case.

THE COURT: All right. I'd allow you to tell me whatever Mr. Saintillus would like the Court to hear. I also did have a question. I see that Mr. Saintillus filed a motion at ECF No. 8. So one of my questions is: Because he filed that, would the appropriate response by the Court be to deny it without prejudice to re-filing by counsel with further

briefing?

Ms. Crager, you can respond to that question, and also let the Court now whatever Mr. Saintillus would like the Court to know at this time.

MS. CRAGER: Yes, your Honor. As to the motion to dismiss, I would request that we just had time to speak with him about that before the Court takes action about it.

I have been in communication with the United States attorney about it, and so that is definitely on our radar and something that we can address maybe just with a filing at a later date.

THE COURT: All right. I'll wait for further clarification from you on behalf Mr. Saintillus. So what else would you like to make a record at this time?

MS. CRAGER: There's really nothing else that I think is appropriate at this time to bring forward. We're currently reviewing discovery. We did receive about 1,400 pages of discovery from the prosecutor in this matter, and we need time to discuss it with our client, and much of it needs to be redacted, and so it's a little bit slow-going there, but we are working on it.

THE COURT: All right. Are you requesting a next date for a status?

MS. CRAGER: Yes, your Honor. We have not previously discussed a date, but if we could have a date about six weeks

out, that would be great.

THE COURT: All right. Does that work for you, Mr. Stefanki?

MR. STEFANKI: Yes, it does, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else you want to say at this time, Mr. Stefanki?

MR. STEFANKI: I do want to put something quite brief on the record, your Honor, and the government did inform defense counsel of this last night, but I would also like the Court to be apprised.

The indictment, as currently filed, alleges that the defendant conspired to dispute over 400 grams of a mixture and substance containing Fentanyl.

There is material in the discovery, which was generated following indictment, which the government believes indicates that the defendant actually conspired to dispute between -- I'm sorry, more than 40 grams of Fentanyl, and that's obviously a necessarily included offense in Count 1 of the indictment, but the government is considering how -- how to move forward with that.

But I do just want that to be on the record here today that -- that defense counsel is aware of this, and the government does not, at this point, intend to proceed on the more than 400 grams charge in Count 1 of the indictment, and that's all. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The government has made its 1 record. The Court does not take any action based on that 2 representation that you've heard that. I assume nothing 3 further to say at this point, Ms. Crager; is that fair? 4 MS. CRAGER: Nothing further about that, your Honor. 5 Thank you. 6 THE COURT: All right. Well, I believe six weeks is 7 June 14th, correct, Ms. Kennison? 8 9 THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Then we'll set this for 10 further status on June 14th. Is there a request to exclude 11 time between now and then, Ms. Crager? 12 MS. CRAGER: Yes, your Honor. We have no objection to 13 a T4 exclusion. 14 THE COURT: All right. Anything else to add to the 15 record on exclusion of time, Mr. Stefanki? 16 MR. STEFANKI: Just to reiterate what the defense 17 counsel said, your Honor. That it is approximately 1,400 pages 18 of discovery. That it does involve a substantial amount of 19 20 information, and the government believes that a T4 exclusion is appropriate on that basis. 21 22 THE COURT: All right. Given the amount of discovery and defense counsel's representation that the six weeks is an 23 appropriate time for reviewing that discovery, and certainly 24

understand what it means for Mr. Saintillus's case, time

25